

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03230 01 OF 02 080023Z

62

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /031 W

----- 077476

O R 072330Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6190

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4084

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3230

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: NATO DECLARATION: NAC DISCUSSION JUNE 7

REF: USNATO 3197, (B) STATE 120289, (C) STATE 120339

BEGIN SUMMARY: COUNCIL CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF ATLANTIC DECLARATION ON JUNE 7, COVERING PARAGAPHS 3, 6, 9, 10 AND 11. FRANCE WITHDREW ITS RESERVATION ON PARAGRAPH 3 AND ACCEPTED AN AMENDMENT IN PARAGRAPH 6, LEAVING NORWAY THE ONLY ALLY WITH RESERVATIONS ON THE LATTER PARAGRAPH. FRANCE RAISED NEW PROBLEM IN PARAGRAPH 10 BUT AGREED TO SEEK COMPROMISE SOLUTION. FRANC LACKED INSTRUCTIONS ON PARAGRAPHS 9 AND 11. SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE CONVENED ON MONDAY, JUNE 10, TO DISCUSS THESE TWO PARAGRAPHS. NEITHER BRITISH NOR OTHER DELEGATIONS HAD NEW INSTRUCTIONS ON THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ISSUE IN PARAGRAPH 9 PENDING DISCUSSION BY EC FOREIGN MINISTERS IN BONN ON JUNE 10 AND 11. SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE CONVENED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, TO HEAR RESULTS OF EC DISCUSSIONS ON THIS ISSUE. MISSION APPRECIATES THE HELPFUL INSTRUCTIONS RECEIVED DURING THIS WEEK'S DISCUSSIONS, PARTICULARLY THE PROMPT REPLY TO USNATO 3197.

END SUMMARY.

1. PARAGRAPH 3

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03230 01 OF 02 080023Z

FRENCH CHARGE (CARRAUD) STATED THAT PARIS COULD NOW CONFIRM THE FRENCH DELEGATION'S ACCEPTANCE OF THE LAST SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 3.

## 2. PARAGRAPH 6

CARRAUD STATED THAT PARIS COULD ACCEPT THE DELETION OF THE WORD "ALSO" IN THE SECOND BRACKETTED ALTERNATIVE BUT WOULD OTHERWISE WISH TO MAINTAIN THAT ALTERNATIVE IN THE TEXT. HE EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT THIS WOULD SATISFY THE OBJECTIONS THAT HAD BEEN MADE BY THE DUTCH AND NORWEGIAN DELEGATIONS. NORWEGIAN CHARGE (KRISTVIK) SAID THAT HE WAS NOT IN A POSITION TO ACCEPT THE FRENCH ALTERNATIVE EVEN WITH DELETION OF THE WORD "ALSO" AND PREFERRED THE FIRST (NORWEGIAN) VERSION OF THE BRACKETTED CLAUSES. HE SAID THERE WAS NOT A GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO BUT THAT THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE OF SUBSTANCE WHICH HE WOULD HAVE TO CHECK WITH HIS FOREIGN MINISTER. HE WOULD ASK FOR AN EARLY REPLY. THE NETHERLANDS AMBASSADOR (HARTOGH) SAID THAT DELETION OF THE WORD "ALSO" WOULD SATISFY THE NETHERLANDS OBJECTION ALTHOUGH HE SYMPATHIZED WITH THE POSITION WHICH HAD BEEN EXPRESSED BY NORWAY. U.K. CHARGE (LOGAN) SAID THAT HE THOUGHT THE TEXT OF THE BRACKETTED ALTERNATIVE PREFERRED BY THE MAJORITY WOULD BE IMPROVED IF THE WORD "WHILE" WERE DELETED AND REPLACED BY A COMMA. THIS WAS ACCEPTED. CARRAUD THEN ASKED WHETHER THE EARLIER VERSION OF THIS PARAGRAPH, IN WHICH THE PRESENT LAST TWO SENTENCES HAD APPEARED AS A SINGLE SENTENCE, WAS NOT PREFERABLE. LOGAN AGREED WITH CARRAUD, COMMENTING THAT THE POSSESSION OF NUCLEAR FORCES WAS NOT THE MAIN POINT OF THIS PARAGRAPH. IT MIGHT THEREFORE BE BETTER NOT TO HAVE A SENTENCE END WITH THE COMMENT THAT TWO EUROPEAN MEMBERS POSSESS NUCLEAR FORCES. THE COUNCIL AGREED WITH THIS SUGGESTION.

PARAGRAPH 6, THUS AMENDED, NOW READS AS FOLLOWS:

"6. NEVERTHELESS, THE ALLIANCE MUST PAY CAREFUL ATTENTION TO THE DANGERS TO WHICH IT IS EXPOSED IN THE EUROPEAN REGION, AND MUST ADOPT ALL MEASURES NECESSARY TO AVERT THEM. THE EUROPEAN MEMBERS, WHO PROVIDE THREE-QUARTERS OF THE CONVENTIONAL STRENGTH OF THE ALLIANCE IN EUROPE, AND TWO OF WHOM POSSESS NUCLEAR FORCES (OF THEIR OWN CAPABLE OF PLAYING A DETERRENT ROLE AND CONTRIBUTING) (CAPABLE OF PLAYING A DETERRENT ROLE OF THEIR OWN, CONTRIBUTING) TO THE OVERALL STRENGTHENING OF THE DETERRENCE OF THE ALLIANCE, UNDERTAKE TO MAKE THE NECESSARY CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTAIN THE COMMON DEFENCE AT A LEVEL CAPABLE OF DETERRING AND IF NECESSARY REPELLING

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03230 01 OF 02 080023Z

ALL ACTIONS DIRECTED AGAINST THE INDEPENDENCE AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ALLIANCE."

## 3. PARAGRAPH 9

DISCUSSION OF THIS PARAGRAPH BEGAN WITH A STATEMENT BY CANADIAN AMBASSADOR (MENZIES) WHO SAID THAT HE HAD REFRAINED FROM COMMENTING PREVIOUSLY ON THE REFERENCE TO THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY BECAUSE HE THOUGHT THAT THE PHRASING OF THE GENERAL THOUGHT WAS A MATTER FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY. HOWEVER, HE WANTED IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT CANADA WAS PARTICULARLY PLEASED TO HAVE INCLUDED IN THE DECLARATION SOME LANGUAGE WHICH LINK THE COMMUNITY AND THE ALLIANCE. MENZIES WOULD BE HAPPY IF

A COMPROMISE COULD BE FOUND, ALTHOUGH HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THERE WERE INTERNAL PROBLEMS IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES WHICH HAD TO BE REKONED WITH. MENZIES CONCLUDED BY SAYING THAT HE DID NOT WISH TO LEAVE ANY DOUBT ABOUT CANADA'S SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN UNITY. BELGIAN AMBASSADOR (DE STAERCKE) THANKED MENZIES FOR HIS STATEMENT AND EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT THE EC MINISTERS MEETING IN BONN ON JUNE 10-11 COULD SOLVE THE PROBLEM. LOGAN ALSO THANKED MENZIES FOR THE UNDERSTANDING HE HAD SHOWN. A/SYG PANSO CLOSED THE DISCUSSION BY NOTING THAT HE WOULD CONVENE A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, TO SEE WHETHER A COMPROMISE HAD BEEN FOUND.

4. RUMSFELD REMINDED THE COUNCIL THAT A SENTENCE WHICH HAD FORMERLY APPEARED JUST BEFORE THE LAST SENTENCE OF PRESENT PARAGRAPH 9 HAD BEEN DELETED IN 4TH REVISION TEXT. HE RECALLED THAT IT WAS RELATED TO THE ISSUES IN PARAGRAPH 11. HE WANTED IT TO BE CLEAR THAT DISCUSSION OF PARAGRAPH 9 COULD NOT BE CONSIDERED COMPLETE UNTIL A SATISFACTORY SOLUTION HAD BEEN FOUND TO THE QUESTION OF WHERE TO PUT THE THOUGHT RELATING TO "EVENTS IN OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD." A/SYG PANSO SAID THAT THIS WAS UNDERSTOOD.

5. PARAGRAPH 10

CARRAUD (FRANCE) SAID THAT HE HAD RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS FROM PARIS TO ASK FOR THE DELETION OF THE WORD "DEFENSE" IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 10. HE EXPLAINED THAT THERE WAS SOME CONCERN IN PARIS THAT THE CLAUSE "ACCORDING TO ITS ROLE IN THE DEFENSE STRUCTURE OF THE ALLIANCE" MIGHT BE MISUNDERSTOOD. PARIS  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03230 01 OF 02 080023Z

DID NOT WANT READERS OF THIS DOCUMENT TO ASSUME THAT THERE WAS SOME EVOLUTION OR DEVELOPMENT IN FRANCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03230 02 OF 02 080038Z

62

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /031 W  
----- 077553

O R 072330Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6191

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4085

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3230

EXDIS

ALLIANCE. THIS SUGGESTION MET WITH OBJECTION FROM TURKISH AMBASSADOR ERALP WHO ASKED WHETHER THERE WAS ANY OTHER DIFFERENCE IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE ALLIANCE EXCEPT IN ITS DEFENSE STRUCTURE. HE PREFERRED TO SAY "DEFENSE STRUCTURE" BECAUSE THEN IT WAS CLEAR WHAT WAS BEING TALKED ABOUT. EFFORTS WERE THEN MADE BY VARIOUS DELEGATIONS TO FIND A SUBSTITUTE FOR "DEFENSE STRUCTURE," INCLUDING SUGGESTIONS FOR "ARRANGEMENTS" AND "ORGANIZATION." THESE SUGGESTIONS FAILED TO WIN SUPPORT AND A/SYG PANSA ASKED THE TURKISH DELEGATION IF IT COULD ASK ANKARA TO SUPPORT THE FRENCH AMENDMENT. ERALP SAID HE WOULD EXPLAIN THE SITUATION TO HIS AUTHORITIES BUT THAT HE HAD CLEAR INSTRUCTIONS ON THIS POINT. HE IN TURN RECOMMENDED THAT THE FRENCH DELEGATION ASK PARIS TO RECONSIDER. RUMSFELD SUGGESTED THAT IT MIGHT HELP IF THE CLAUSE WERE AMENDED TO READ: "ACCORDING TO THE ROLE IT ASSUMES (OR HAS ASSUMED) IN THE DEFENSE STRUCTURE OF THE ALLIANCE." ITALIAN AMBASSADOR CATALANO AND DE STAERCKE URGED THIS SOLUTION ON THE FRENCH DELEGATION. ERALP SAID THAT HE COULD ACCEPT THIS FORMULA. A/SYG PANSA ASKED IF CARRAUD WOULD TRY THIS ON ON PARIS AND CARRAUD AGREED TO DO SO.

#### 6. PARAGRAPH 11

CARRAUD STATED THAT HE HAD RECEIVED NO INSTRUCTIONS FROM PARIS ON THIS PARAGRAPH BECAUSE THERE HAD BEEN SOME CONFUSION ABOUT APPOINTMENTS IN PARIS. HE WOULD ONLY SAY AT THIS POINT THAT THE CLAUSE WHICH SPOKE OF "OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD" WAS  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03230 02 OF 02 080038Z

NOT LIKELY TO BE CONSIDERED SATISFACTORY IN PARIS. COMMENT:  
CARRAUD HAD CALLED RUMSFELD BEFORE THE COUNCIL MEETING TO EXPLAIN THAT DE ROSE HAD NOT BEEN ABLE TO SEE THE FRENCH FOREIGN MINISTER AT THE TIME HE HAD EXPECTED TO AND THAT DE ROSE WOULD NOT BE RETURNING TO BRUSSELS UNTIL LATER IN THE DAY. HE SAID THAT DE ROSE HAD ASKED WHETHER HE COULD SEE RUMSFELD ON SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 8. RUMSFELD AGREED AND AN APPOINTMENT WITH DE ROSE IS NOT SET FOR 11:00 A.M. BRUSSELS TIME, JUNE 8. MISSION HAS NOTIFIED U.K. DEL AND HAS UNDERTAKEN TO INFORM LOGAN OF CONTENTS OF THE DISCUSSION. END COMMENT.

7. DE STAERCKE EXPLAINED TO THE COUNCIL, AS HE HAD PREVIOUSLY IN THE JUNE 6 PRIVATE MEETING (USNATO 3188), THAT THE CLAUSE INCLUDING "OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD" HAD BEEN A DUTCH IDEA WHICH HAD BEEN INCORPORATED IN THE BELGIUN REVISION. IT HAD NOT ORIGINALLY BEEN A BELGIAN SUGGESTION. DANISH AMBASSADOR SVART SAID THAT HE WS INCLINED TO THINK THAT THE CLAUSE BEING QUESTIONED HELPED TO EXPLAIN THE NATURE OF CONSULTATION MORE EFFECTIVELY. RUMSFELD AGREED THAT THIS CLAUSE WAS A USEFUL POINT TO MAKE IN THIS PARAGRAPH AND HE NOED THAT IT WAS CONDITIONAL IN THAT IT SAID THEIR INTERESTS BEGIN UNDERSCORE CAN END UNDERSCORE BE AFFECTED BY EVENTS IN OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD. MENZIES SAID THAT THE FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THIS THOUGHT SEEMED TO CARRY A DIFFERENT AND STRONGER CONNOTATION THAN THE

ENGLISH TEXT. DE STAERCKE AGREED THAT THE FRENCH DID HAVE A DIFFERENT CONNOTATION. (COMMENT: MISSION IS TRANSMITTING SEPTEL FULL TEXT OF DECLARATION IN FRENCH. END COMMENT)

7. AT THIS POINT HARTOGH ASKED WHAT PROCEDURES THE COUNCIL INTENDED TO FOLLOW SINCE A COUNCIL MEETING ON JUNE 12 WOULD BE EXTREMELY LATE TO DISCUSS THE COMPLICATED ISSUES INVOLVED IN PARAGRAPHS 11 AND 9. PANSA REPLIED THAT ON THESE PARAGRAPHS, A COUNCIL MEETING COULD BE CONVENED ON MONDAY, JUNE 10. THE REASON FOR THE COUNCIL ON JUNE 12 WOULD BE TO AWAIT WORD FROM THE EC FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETING ON THE ISSUE OF EUROPEAN UNION IN PARAGRAPH 9. RUMSFELD, SUMMARIZING THE ISSUES THAT WOULD BE DISCUSSED IN THE JUNE 10 NAC, SAID THAT HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE COUNCIL WOULD ADDRESS THE QUESTION OF THE CLAUSE ON "OTHER AREAS," INCLUDING WHETHER TO PLACE IT IN 11 OR IN 9, OR BOTH PLACES AND THE LANGUAGE IN THE PENULTIMATE SENTENCE OF THE CURRENT PARAGRAPH 11. CARRAUD SAID THAT HE ALSO UNDERSTOOD THE ISSUES THIS WAY AND  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03230 02 OF 02 080038Z

SUGGESTED THAT IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO HEAR ANY FURTHER COMMENTS DELEGATIONS MIGHT HAVE ON THESE POINTS. SVART INQUIRED ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF THE PHRASE IN THE PENULTIMATE SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 11: "ACCORDING TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR RELATIONS." LOGAN REPLIED THAT IT HAD COME FROM THE BRITISH TEXT AND IT HAD ORIGINALLY SPOKEN OF "EVOLVING RELATIONS." RUMSFELD, DRAWING ON REF C, SAID THAT THE U.S. ATTACHED IMPORTANCE TO THIS PHRASE BECAUSE IT EVOKED THE IDEA OF THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE ALLIANCE WHICH THE COUNCIL HAD SO OFTEN DISCUSSED. RUMSFELD SAID IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO INCLUDE IN THE DECLARATION THE IDEA THAT THE ALLIANCE HAD ADAPTED TO CHANGE AND THAT IT COULD ADAPT TO CHANGE IN THE FUTURE, THAT IT WAS NOT IN A STATE OF RIGOR MORTIS, AND THAT IT WAS CAPABLE OF EVOLUTION. CATALANO SAID THAT HE COULD ACCEPT THE PHRASE WHICH RUMSFELD WAS ADDRESSING BUT THAT ROME HAD DIFFICULTIES ACCEPTING THE WORD "EVOLVING" IN THIS PHRASE. HARTOGH ASKED WHETHER THE POINTS RUMSFELD HAD MADE WOULD BE UNDERSTOOD IF THE WORD "EVOLVING" WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE PHRASE. RUMSFELD SAID HE THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE. CARRAUD REMINDED THE COUNCIL THAT THE FRENCH HAD SUGGESTED A DIFFERENT ENDING FOR THIS SENTENCE AND THAT FRANCE CONSIDERED THAT THE CLAUSE CONCERNING "OTHER AREAS OF THE WORLD" COULD BE EXPRESSED WITH MORE AUTHORITY IN PARAGRAPH 9.

8. COUNCIL THEN BRIEFLY DISCUSSED PARAGRAPH 14, DECIDING FOR EDITORIAL REASONS TO RECOMMEND DELETION OF THE WORD "THUS" IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE PARAGRAPH. U.K. (LOGAN) SUPPORTED DELETION BUT POINTED OUT THAT IF THE DECLARATION IS SIGNED, IT MIGHT BE MORE APPROPRIATE TO REINSERT THE WORD "THUS" IN THIS PARAGRAPH WHICH WOULD IMMEDIATELY PRECEDE SIGNATURE.

9. THE MEETING CONCLUDED WITH CANADIAN AMBASSADOR MENZIES SUGGESTING THAT SINCE THE DECLARATION WAS MOVING CLOSER TO

AGREEMENT, ALL THE ALLIES SHOULD AVOID PROVIDING THE PRESS WITH ANY OF THE SPECIFICS OF THE DECLARATION. ANY COMMENT MADE SHOULD BE GENERAL. DE STAERCKE COMMENTED THAT THIS WAS EXACTLY WHAT SECRETARY KISSINGER HAD DONE IN HIS PRESS CONFERENCE OF JUNE 6.  
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 07 JUN 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO03230  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740687/abbryvmg.tel  
**Line Count:** 277  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** USNATO 3197, (B) STATE 120289, (C) STATE 120339  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <02 APR 2002 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <13 JUN 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** NATO DECLARATION: NAC DISCUSSION JUNE 7  
**TAGS:** PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
**EC BRUSSELS**  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005